UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/823,585	04/14/2004	James Kam Fu Kong	V9661.0049	6212		
32172 DICKSTEIN SI	7590 06/25/200 HAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER				
	OF THE AMERICAS	JACKSON, BRANDON LEE				
NEW YORK, N	NY 10030-2714		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3772			
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
			06/25/2008	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			10/823,585		FU KONG ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			BRANDON	JACKSON	3772				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the o	correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN INSIGN SOLUTION IN INSIGN SOLU	MAILING DA's of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. tatutory period will y will, by statute, co	TE OF THIS 6(a). In no even Il apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION t, however, may a reply be tine expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>29 Ma</i>	v 2008						
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 May 2008</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
′=		<i>7</i> —			osecution as to the	e merits is			
٠,١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the	application.							
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u> </u>								
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
•	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election red	quirement.					
	on Papers								
	• The specification is objected to by th	ne Evaminer							
	-			ented or h) ohiec	ted to by the Evan	niner			
10)23	10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 December 2007</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
2) Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Ination Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-948)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to amendments/arguments filed 5/29/2008. Currently, claims 1-20 are pending in the instant application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/29/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/29/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the Kurland lateralization member (18) is rigid and not capable of rotation to affect the angular orientation of the lateralization member, adjusting the lateralization effect. However, the Kurland lateralization member (18) is mounted upon a threaded support member (32). The lateralization member (18) is capable of rotating about the support member (32, 33, 34) because the support member (32, 33, 34) is threaded. Therefore, when the Kurland lateralization device is modified with the eccentric lateralization member of Kostich, the eccentric nature of the Kurland/Kostich lateralization member would cause a change in the angular orientation

Art Unit: 3772

of the lateralization member when rotated about the threaded support post. Rotating the lateralization member of Kurland/Kostich would allow the user to adjust lateralization member, which in turn would alter the lateralization effect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurland (US Patent 4,653,482). Kurland discloses a lateralization device (fig. 1) comprising a supporting member (32, 33, 34) adapted to be supported in a fixed position, a lateralization member (18, 31) mounted onto the supporting member (32, 33, 34) and expanding laterally therefrom to provide a lateralization effect to a user's body portion, wherein the lateralization effect varies in different lateral directions via moving the lateralization device (fig. 1) along the lateral slot (19). The supporting member (32, 33, 34) comprises a post member (32), wherein the post member (32) comprises a substantially cylindrical outer wall. The post member (32) comprises a plurality of interference fittings (fig. 4) on the outer wall for engaging with complementary interference fittings (fig. 4) formed on an inner wall of the lateralization member (18, 31). The lateralization member (18, 31) is formed of a material that can resist pressure exerted thereon and maintain its initial shape during moral use. The lateralization

member (18, 31) comprises a substantially cylindrical member (31) with a recessed portion (fig. 4) formed by an inner wall, wherein the cylindrical member (31) has a substantially circular cross-section. The lateralization member (18, 31) comprises a padding member (col. 2, lines 41-42) that wraps around the lateralization member (18, 31). The lateralization member (18, 31) can rotate relative to the supporting member (32, 33, 34). The lateralization member (18, 31) is fully capable of being used to provide lateralization to a user's hip joint during a hip arthroscopy. The supporting member (32, 33, 34) is adapted to be mounted onto a fracture table.

With respect to claims 19-20, Kurland discloses all the structural elements of the claimed invention; therefore, the method steps would have resulted from the use of the Kurland device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 8, 13, and 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US Patent 4,653,482) in view of Kostich (US Patent 5,623,949). Kurland substantially discloses the claimed invention; see rejections to 1-7, 9-12, and 14 above. Kurland fails to disclose the recessed portion is located in an eccentric position on the cylindrical member. However, Kostich teaches a positioning device (110) comprising eccentric cylindrical members (144). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lateralization member of Kurland to have the shape, as taught by Kostich, in order to better receive body parts and provide the user with more comfort. The eccentric nature of the Kurland/Kostich lateralization member would cause a change in the angular orientation of the lateralization member when rotated about the threaded support post. Rotating the lateralization member of Kurland/Kostich would allow the user to adjust lateralization member, which in turn would alter the lateralization effect.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US Patent 4,653,482) in view of Spetzler et al. (US Patent 6,805,453). Kurland substantially discloses the claimed invention; see rejection to claim 1 above. Spetzler teaches a medical device (100) comprising a drape (110) to cover the device (100). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Miller device to have a drape covering the lateralization device, as taught by Spetzler, in order to keep the device sterile after usage.

Art Unit: 3772

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3414. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571)272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon Jackson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3772

BLJ

/Patricia Bianco/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3772